

Poetry.

GO FEEL WHAT I HAVE FELT.

[A young lady in New York was in the habit of writing for a Philadelphia paper on the subject of temperance. Her writing evinced such deep emotion that her friends accused her of being a maniac on the subject of temperance, whereupon she wrote the following stanzas.—*Religious Herald*.]

Go feel what I have felt,

Go bear what I have borne—
Sink 'neath the blows a father dealt,
And the cold world's proud scorn,
Then suffer on from year to year—
Thy sole relief the scorching tear.

Go kneel, as I have knelt,
Implore, beseech, and pray—
Strive the besotted heart to melt,
The downward course to stay—
Be dashed with bitter curse aside,
Your prayers burlesqued, your tears defied.

Go weep as I have wept
O'er a loved father's fall—
See every promised blessing swept—
Youth's sweetness turned to gall—
Life's fading flowers strewed all the way,
That brought me up to woman's day.

Go see what I have seen,
Behold the strong man bowed—
With gnashing teeth, lips bathed in blood,
A cold and livid brow;
Go catch his withering glance, and see
There mirrored his soul's misery.

Go hear, and feel, and see, and know
All that my soul hath felt and known.
Then look upon the wine cup's glow,
See if its beauty can atone—
Think if its flavor you will try
When all proclaims, "Tis drink and die!"

Tell me I hate the bowl—
Hate is a feeble word:
I loathe—abhor—my very soul
With strong disgust is stirred,
Whene'er I hear or tell,
Of the dark beverage of hell.

Contributions.

"ERRORS OF DUNKARDISM" REFUTED.

J. O. TALLEY.

In the issue of May 28, of the Trumpet Call, a paper published by the so called "Holiness People," there appears an article entitled "Errors of Dunkardism," which I would not deign to notice were it not for the false statements of the premises of the doctrine, the versatile author tries to refute. I shall not aim to follow the long three columns of acrimony and misstatements, all of which are entirely out of place. It can not be that "complete sanctification and absolute holiness," can be the fountain from which flows such bitter waters.

As to the statement that the brethren, (whom he calls Dunkards,) hold that the Lord ate the last supper two days before the Passover, I need not reply, for all who are familiar with the Brethren Church and her teachings know that such is not a

claim of our teaching. But that the Lord did eat deipnon, (not paschal) on the evening before the Jews ate the Passover is believed by many of us, and that the Lord did establish the Lord's Supper, the communion of the bread and wine, and the ordinance of feet washing on the evening of that last supper, is believed by all of us, and is conceded by all scholars, and history of the early Christian church confirm the view that the Eucharist is a term that comprehends a full meal eaten in conjunction with the bread and wine, to wit: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed, and break, and gave to them, and said take eat, this is my body." Mark 14: 22. "And as they were eating Jesus took bread and blessed it, and break it, and gave it to the disciples and said, take eat, this is my body." Matt. 26: 26. And many other scriptures might be cited to show that they were eating the supper when He broke the bread. And Luke says, "Likewise the cup *after supper*, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Now it is clear that he was betrayed on the night on which he ate the last supper. Luke 22: 20, 21; John 13: And that he was arrested on the next morning, tried before Herod and Pilate and then crucified, to which all the Gospel narratives agree.

Now while the Saviour was before Pilate on trial, "the Jews would not go into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover," (Paschal) not unleavened bread, as Mr. Howard cunningly insinuates. Now from this it is clear that when the Lord was on trial, the morning after he instituted the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, the Jews had not eaten the Passover. John 18: 28.

Now after the Lord was crucified and on the cross, had bowed his head and given up the Ghost, the Jews, "because it was the preparation," that the bodies should not be left on the cross on the Sabbath day, (for that was a high day,) begged Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." John 19: 31.

Now we see that the Lord was on the cross on the "preparation day." Preparation day of what? Why the preparation day of the Passover, that day on which the Jews should slay the lamb.

I note that this day was also the preparation for the Sabbath, and the feast occurring in conjunction with the preparation for the Sabbath, made it an especially "high day" among the Jews.

As to the elements of this supper there

is no ground for discussion, and no well informed *Dunkard* ever contends that it was "a soup supper," but it was a supper of the usual elements of such an evening meal, and is called in the Epistles, Agapae (love feast,) and that the early church universally observed the love feast, is the testimony of all history. I Cor. 11: 20; Jude 12; II Pet. 2: 13. It is true that the Apostle condemns the Corinthians for assembling at the feast in an unworthy manner, as also does Jude and Peter in the scriptures. So also does he condemn the eating of the bread, and the drinking of the cup in an unworthy manner, and if the condemnation pronounced on the unworthy assemblage at the feast is argued against the supper, let it also be noted that the same argument is applied to the bread and wine, to wit: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord *unworthily*, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." But let a man examine *himself*, (not somebody else, or somebody's communion,) and so let him eat that bread, and drink that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." I Cor. 11: 26-29.

We are all aware of the fact that the supper is not love, but is a symbol of love, even as baptism is not a new birth, but it is a heaven blessed symbol of the God begotten, which all Christian churches recognize in some form. So is also the Lord's Supper a symbol of a divine presence in a *feast of love*. The Lord's Supper points forward to the second coming of the Lord. "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he shall return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto *Him immediately*. Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when he cometh shall find watching; verily I say unto you that he shall gird *himself*, and make them sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them." Woe unto those churches that have abandoned the feast of love, and service of each other, for they will not be ready. It is as logical to symbolize love by a feast, at which rich and poor come to the same level, as it is to symbolize a broken body of the Lord by the broken bread, or the spilled blood by the wine, or the new birth by baptism. Brethren, a holy people are those who wholly follow the Lord. He was judged of a wicked world, condemned to death by sinners, he gave to his followers a feast of love, (for he loved them unto the